

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/650,004	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GAZDIC ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MEAGAN THOMASSON	<b>Art Unit</b> 3714	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Meagan Thomasson.

(3) Daniel Burnham.

(2) John Hotaling.

(4) Jeremie Moll

Date of Interview: 31 January 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 66 and 68.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



  
**JOHN M. HOTALING, II**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In order to place the application in condition for allowance, the examiner proposed amending independent claim 66 to further include the limitation of "the assignment of possible different behaviors is based on probabilities associated with a randomly selected outcome for that character ..." as recited in dependent claim 68. Additionally, the dependency of claim 69 has been amended to depend from claim 66. The applicant has agreed to include the limitation of claim 68 into claim 66, placing the application in condition for allowance.